

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement and annotated sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to FIG. 11 as follows.

FIG. 11 has been amended to change reference numeral 910 to 913

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (formal)
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The office action mailed March 10, 2006, has been carefully considered. Within the office action, Claims 1-5 and 7-15 have been allowed, and Claims 16-25 have been rejected. In addition, Claim 6 has been objected to. The applicant has amended Claims 6, 16, 21, and 23-25. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Informal Objections

Within the office action several paragraphs have been objected to for various informalities. In response, the applicant has amended paragraphs 24, 26, 36, 38, 41, 50, 56, 63 and 73 to fix these informalities. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests the objections to be withdrawn.

Drawings

The drawings have been rejected under 37 C.F.R.1.84(p)(4) for various informalities. The applicant hereby submits corrected formal drawings. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claim 6 has been rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The applicant has amended Claim 6 to overcome this rejection and accordingly request that the objection be withdrawn.

In addition, Claims 23-25 have been rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and artistically claim the subject matter which the outcome in regards to the invention.

The applicant has amended Claims 23-25 to overcome this rejection. The applicant submits that the amendments do not necessarily alter the scope of the claim and were voluntarily made.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 101

Within the office action, Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The office action states that Claims 23-25 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicant has amended Claims 23-25 to recite among other things that the code represents instructions to cause the computer processor which is configured to be operatively coupled to an apparatus to perform a method. Accordingly, the applicant submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 102

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,872,952 to Poggie (hereinafter referred to as “Poggie”). The applicant respectfully traverses.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Poggie recites a vehicle wheel anti-skid apparatus which senses a torque applied to a vehicle wheel, whereby torque is applied by the road. The torque is used to power the brake and limits the brake capacity so that it cannot exceed the force capacity of the wheel road contact of the anti-skid system. The system also uses changes in the wheel torque to operate a servo valve

which pluses the brake and special road situations and compensates for the local compressibility of the hydraulic fluid. (Poggie, Abstract).

In contrast to Claim 16, Poggie does not disclose that a pressure is applied to a cavity defined by the moveable member and the braking member. In an embodiment in the present specification, the braking member has a cavity which is defined as the volume between the braking member and the moveable member when a negative or a positive pressure is applied to the cavity. A modification of pressure within the cavity causes a resistive force to be applied to the moveable member. Poggie, however, does not describe a cavity which is defined between the braking member and the movable member. In fact, Poggie just shows an open space between braking member 42 and moveable member 17 in Figure 1. In addition, Poggie does not teach, in any manner, that the resistive force is applied to the moveable member to provide a haptic effect. For at least these reasons, Poggie does not disclose, inherently or expressly, each and every element and limitation recited in Claim 16. Accordingly, Claim 16 is distinguishable over Poggie, and the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Claim 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 17-20 are dependent on Independent Claim 16. As stated above, Claim 16 is allowable over Poggie. Accordingly, Claims 17-20 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-25 have stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Poggie. The applicant respectfully traverses.

For at least the reasons stated above, Poggie does not disclose a cavity defined between a braking member and a moveable member as recited in Claim 23. In addition, Poggie does not recite that resist of force is output to provide a haptic effect. As stated above, Poggie only stands

for the proposition of using the system to provide an anti-skid means for controlling torque and special road situations. For at least these reasons, once skilled in the art would have no motivation to use Poggie individually or in combination with another reference to reach the invention in Claim 23. Accordingly, Claim 23 is allowable over Poggie.

In addition, Claims 24 and 25 are dependent upon Claim 23 and are also allowable for being dependent on an allowable base Claim. Claims 21-22 are dependent on Claim 16 which is allowable over Poggie for at least the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claims 21-22 are also allowable for being dependent on an allowable base Claim.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Dated: 6/12/06

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040



BEST AVAILABLE COPY